UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,983	03/26/2004	Yar-Ming Wang	GP-304670	9619
Kathryn A. Mai	7590	EXAMINER		
General Motors	Corporation	MAYEKAR, KISHOR		
Mail Code 482- PO Box 300	·C23-B21	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Detroit, MI 482	65-3000	1795		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Communication		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/810,98	3	WANG ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Kishor Ma		1795				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with the o	correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR INCHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INTERPRETARIES OF THE MAILING	NG DATE OF TH CFR 1.136(a). In no evention. period will apply and will y statute, cause the app	IIS COMMUNICATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 04 March 2008						
-	• •	☐ This action is n	on-final					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the applic	cation.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>120</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
-	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election re	equirement.					
	on Papers							
	• The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer						
•	-		Objected to by the	Examiner				
.0/	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	-	oreign priority up	lor 35 S C 8 110/a	\-(d) or (f)				
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)	a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies flot received.								
Attachmen			л. П	(DTO 443)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	148)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application								
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:								

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Gernon et al. (US 6,187,169 B1). Gernon's invention is directed to a method for the generation of organosulfonic acid from its salts. Gernon discloses in col. 9, lines 12-28 that, if cathodic hydrogen formation is not desired and the metal being deposited has a tendency to promote hydrogen formation, the method comprises the recited steps of producing and transporting.
- 3. Claims 11-13, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gernon '169. The differences between Gernon are the recited voltage and current density and the overlapping of pH range.

As the two former difference, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the reference's teachings because it has been settled that proper adjustment of

Art Unit: 1795

a known effective variable of a known or obvious process is within the capabilities of one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Aller 105 USPQ 233; In re Boesch 205 USPQ 215.

As to the overlapping of pH range, it has been held that the disclosure in the prior art of any value within the claimed range is an anticipation of that range. And a prima facie case of obviousness exists in the case where the claimed range overlaps range disclosed by the prior art, In re Wertheim 191 USPQ 90.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 14, 15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polan et al. (US 4,568,431) by itself or in view of Gernon '169. Polan's invention, a reference cited in the last Office action, is directed to a process for producing electroplated and/or treated metal foil. Polan discloses that the process comprises an electrolytic cleaning as a pretreatment step wherein the electrolytic cleaning is primarily to remove residual grease, oil and other contaminants from earlier processing of the foil (col. 5, lines 3-68), the provision a surface impurity removing means including a skimmer floating on the surface of a treating solution in the tank and/or an overflow system for removing solution from the tank and passing it through an off-line solution filtration/replenishment loop (col. 2, lines 39-55), and the continuous withdrawal of solution from tank 14 (Fig. 2). Although Polan does not disclose the limitation that the electrolytic cleaning dislodges adhered metal particle matter from the surface, however since Polan discloses the electrolytic cleaning being primarily to remove residual grease, oil and other contaminants from earlier processing of the foil and the agitation produced at the foil surfaces by the hydrogen bubbles generated from the electrolysis (the electrolytic cleaning), it appears that Polan's process would lead one skilled in the art towards the limitation in absence of evidence to the contrary when the other contaminants are metal particle matter. This evidence is taught when combining Polan's teachings with Gernon's teachings, where Gernon's teachings are applied in the preceding paragraphs.

As to the subject matters of claims 17, 19 and 20, it has been held that the disclosure in the prior art of any value within the claimed range is an anticipation of that range. And a prima facie case of obviousness exists in the case where the claimed range overlaps range disclosed by the prior art, *In re Wertheim* 191 USPQ 90.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Polan '431 or Polan '431 in view of Gernon '169 as applied to claims 1, 2, 4-10, 14, 15 and 17-20 above, and further in view of Lauke (US 4,568,438). Polan as applied above further discloses in col. 9, line 56 through col. 10, line 54 the continuous withdrawal of the solution to remove the surface impurities or contaminants from the treatment tank 14. The difference between the reference(s) as applied above and the instant is the provision of the recited eductor. Lauke, another reference cite din the last Office action, teaches in a method for making an electroimmersion finish the limitation (Figs. 1 and 2). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Polan's teachings as shown by Lauke because the selection of any of known recirculation of the solution with contaminant removal would

Page 5

have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

6. Claims 11-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

either Polan '431 or Polan '431 in view of Gernon '169 as applied to claims 1, 2, 4-10, 14, 15

and 17-20 above, and further in view of Sallo et al. (US 3,668,090) or Smith (US

4,270,986), both references in the last Office action. The difference between the

reference(s) as applied above and the instant claims is the recited voltage and electrolyte

medium. Sallo teaches in a method of electroalkaline cleaning process of ferrous strands

the limitations (col. 1, line 51 through col. 2, line 52). Smith teaches the same in a method

for soldering aluminum (paragraph 2). The subject matter as a whole would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified the reference(s)'s teachings as shown by either Sallo or Smith because the

selection of voltage and electrolyte medium for the cathodic cleaning would have been

within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 4 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the new ground of rejections as set forth in the paragraphs

above.

Conclusion

Page 6

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,983 Page 7

Art Unit: 1795

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-

217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN

USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kishor Mayekar/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795